

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/835,491	OZAWA ET AL.
	Examiner Thoi V. Duong	Art Unit 2871

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thoi V. Duong. (3)_____.

(2) Randi Isaacs. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 24 May 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 7 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Numano and Takahara.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed proposed amendment for claims 1 and 10. The examiner will reconsider the claims when receiving an official amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/835,491 First Named Applicant: Kinya OZAWA
 Examiner: T. Duong Art Unit: 2871 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Examiner Duong (2) Randi Isaacs

(3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: 05/24/05 Proposed Time: 10:00 (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) Telephonic (2) Personal (3) Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: YES NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej. 103</u>	<u>1, 2</u>	<u>6,141,074;</u> <u>6,313,898;</u> <u>6,160,535</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>Rej. 103</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6,141,074;</u> <u>6,313,898;</u> <u>6,160,535</u> <u>6,218,679</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) <u>Rej. 103</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>6,160,535;</u> <u>6,040,890</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Proposed Amendments. Specifically, none of the applied references teach or suggest a liquid crystal device that includes a first light shielding film disposed between the first substrate and the switching element at a region corresponding to the switching element but not at a region corresponding to between adjacent pixel areas; and a second light shielding film disposed between the switching element and the liquid crystal at the region corresponding to the switching element but not at the region corresponding to between adjacent pixel areas," as recited in proposed amended independent claim 1. None of the applied references teach or suggest "adjacent pixel electrodes being separate from each other by a space L of approximately 1 μm," as recited in proposed amended independent claim 10.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____

NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)